

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/748,619	12/27/2003	Vladimir S. Moxson		7498	
ADVANCE M	7590 06/09/200 ATERIALS PRODUC	EXAM	EXAMINER		
1890 GEORGETOWN ROAD			ZHU, WEIPING		
HUDSON, OH	1 44236	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
		1793			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/09/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
10/748,619		MOXSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WEIPING ZHU	1793	

	WEIPING ZHU	1793				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 18 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.				
 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appendor for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection					
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ta 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of firm may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
NOTICE OF APPEAL						
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed) 	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause			
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red		ne issues for			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the					
non-allowable claim(s).		•				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected b Claim(s) rejected: <u>2-4 and 17-19</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 5-14.						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing- entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
of the reasons as stated in the final rejection.	DTO/SP/09) Paper No(a)					
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet. 	г 10/36/06) Paper No(s)					
/George Wyszomierski/	/Weiping Zhu/					
Primary Examiner	Examiner, Art Unit 1793					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Examiner, Art Unit 1793

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The limitations of proposed new claim 20 were not contained in the finally rejected claims and would require further search/consideration based on the change in the scope. Therefore, the proposed amendment filed on May 18, 2009 has not been entered.

Continuation of 13. Other: The examiner has responded properly to all applicant's arguments in the applicant's amendment filed on December 22, 2008 after the non-final Office action dated November 4, 2008. The following responses are to applicant's new arguments in the response dated May 18, 2009.

In response to applicant's argument that neither Gottselig et al. (US 4,961,529) nor Toyoda et al. (US Pub. 2003/0064068 A1) relates to titanium matrix composite materials; and Brupbacher et al. (US 5,059,490) in view of Gottselig et al. (US 4,961,529) and further in view of Toyoda et al. (US Pub. 2003/0064969 A1) does not disclose titanium matrix composite articles having improved mechanical properties as claimed in instant claims 24 and 17 19, the examiner notes that the prior art teaqchings with respect to titanium matrix composite material relies on the teaching of Brupbacher et al. rather than those of Gottselig et al. and Toyoda et al. No mechanical properties are recited in the instant claims, and therefore Brupbacher et al. in view of Gottselig et al. and Toyoda et al. are not required to disclose such properties of the titanium matrix composite materials in order to render the claimed materials obvious.

In response to applicant's argument that none of the prior art references contains aluminum-vanadium AIBVS hard particles which are additionally incorporated into itanium matrix according to instant claim 4, the examiner notes that the titanium matrix composite material of Brupbacher et al.= in view of Gottselig et al. and Toyoda et al. contains TiCr2 as recited in instant claim 4. The presence of AI8VS in the material is not required in the instant claim 4.